



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

proposed resolution with my whole heart's strength, and with all the energy of my faith."

On the same general theme spoke also a Spaniard from Madrid, DON SOLER, in good English, with much effect, and likewise a French Editor of an educational journal at Paris, M. JULES DELBRUCK, some of whose remarks were given in English to the Congress by Mr. COBDEN, for the benefit especially of parties. — 'His friend had spoken about the necessity for care in the choice of toys placed in the hands of children. He had spoken against the custom of giving to children those kind of playthings which would tend to familiarize them to feelings and habits of war — of a custom which he (Mr. Cobden) knew to be very prevalent in France, and to be certainly not unknown in this country, of giving to children, for instance, figures of soldiers for playthings, and teaching them to set up red coats against blue coats. And those little things of tin or lead were made to march against one another with mimic swords and muskets; and thus the children were early taught to rejoice, if they were English children, when the red coats overthrew the blue coats, and, if they were French, when the blue coats overthrew the red coats; and he, therefore, recommended mothers to be careful not to allow their children to be accustomed to these mimic scenes of war.'

STIPULATED ARBITRATION AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR WAR.

M. VISSCHERS, of Brussels, and *President of the Peace Congress in 1848*, spoke in English as follows: —

Gentlemen, I support the resolution because I consider arbitration as the rational and practical means, as the only rational and complete means, of settling the differences which arise between nations. Everybody acknowledges the evils of war, its inequity as a mode of determining justice, its deplorable consequences for the life, fortune and security of citizens. It has produced those heavy burthens which make the present generation pay for the errors, follies and crimes of their predecessors.

But some think there is no remedy for the evils of the present state of things, and others recommend remedies which are either inefficacious or unacceptable. Among this latter class of remedies, I would mention a proposal which I have often heard suggested, namely, to invent engines of destruction of so formidable a character as to make war become impossible. The authors of this scheme remind me of the story of a Dutch innkeeper, mentioned by Kant, the celebrated philosopher of Königsberg, in his *Project of Perpetual Peace*. This worthy innkeeper had taken for his sign, "Eternal Peace;" but, under those words he had painted a *church-yard*. Others have said, with Franklin, that, considering the uncertainty of the chances of war, it would be preferable, in order to avoid its calamities, to take the dice, and run the hazard of the throw. Others have gone so far as to propose to renew the combat between the Horatii and the Curatii, and to have recourse on both sides to champions. An emperor of the east, it is said, made such a proposal to a prince with whom he was at war; the chiefs of both parties were to come to a personal encounter. But the prince, like a true barbarian, replied, "a blacksmith who has good tongs, does not take red-hot irons out of the fire with his fingers!"

An advantage which war offers, and which mere chance does not present, (but the thought is shocking to humanity,) is that, after both sides have let loose passions, hatred and fury, the victor secures his triumph, if not by the total destruction of his foes, at least by their partial destruction and by their moral and physical exhaustion. War, indeed, is believed to offer this advantage; but it renders hatred eternal, and provokes reprisals; peace alone brings with it peace for sufferings, balm for wounds, and oblivion of injuries.

For the want of an amicable understanding, arbitration, therefore, remains as a logical means of settling disputes by securing right and justice. Is this means practicable? May we hope to see it adopted by the public law, I shall not say of Europe, but of the whole world?

If we refer to the primitive state of man, we observe everywhere misery and isolation, and neighbors in a state a permanent mistrust, and often hostility. Let us pass rapidly over historical periods. Let us not dwell on the private feuds of the middle ages, when castle against castle, town against town, village against village, every one was at war. For a long time the great vassals had kept this privilege to themselves; it at length disappeared before the extension of the central power. The heads of states alone have preserved this right. Nevertheless, private confederacies, sometimes comprising extensive states, have been formed — to say nothing of the leagues of antiquity and of the middle ages; look at the Germanic Confederation and the Swiss Union, which subsist to the present day. The United States of North America afford us another example. So well have these confederacies understood that war is a source of ruin for nations, that they have formally forbidden it in the states forming their union, either between those states themselves, or with foreign states, without the consent of the Supreme Diet. I hold in my hand a copy of the enactments which have limited the right of war in these different confederacies, and substituted arbitration. Let the Americans, the Germans, and the Swiss here present, bear witness to what I say. Do not these enactments exist? — for the United States, in the act of federation and perpetual peace of 1788; for the Germanic confederation, in the act of 8th of June, 1815; for Switzerland, in the federal compact of 1815, confirmed in 1830? Vattel, who wrote more than a century ago, and whose authority is beyond suspicion, informs us that this custom among the Swiss of introducing in the treaties between the cantons, or with the neighboring states, stipulations relative to arbitration, in case of differences which could not be brought to an amicable adjustment, had contributed to render their country flourishing, and to give it the security which it so long enjoyed.

Thus, not only the process of unity which has been carried out in large states, but even the feeling of common welfare in states belonging to the same family, and united together, has succeeded in making the dominion of war less extensive. How many congresses have we seen assembled since 1815? The interests of nations are now treated in cabinets, and no longer on battle-fields; intelligence has superseded the sword. The public law of Europe is entirely established on a legal foundation, and sanctions the admission of new states into the great political family. It was thus that arbitration, by compelling the Belgians and the Dutch to lay down their arms in 1830, constituted the new kingdom of Belgium. The country to which I belong, Gentlemen, does not form a part of any confederation; yet all the great powers, with one consent, have agreed in forbidding it the right of making war, and decided that, in case of differences arising with other nations, Belgium should have recourse to arbitration. Belgium has submitted to this decision, because she feels that she forms a part of European federation; her position is not an exception, it is what ought to be, the rule.

We referred just now to the starting point of mankind; misery, isolation, and war. Without reviewing the intermediate stages which have brought humanity to the pitch of civilization which it has now reached, we may observe that wealth, the charm and security of relations, and peace, are the results of that civilization, that is to say, of the exertions and intelligence of man. Why should this action of the collective intelligence of mankind stop here? If treaties have established the European equilibrium, the present organization of the states of Europe; if they have fixed the main points of international public law, and, when they could not prevent war, have, at all events, regulated and directed its exercise, why should not the same public law add new enactments to those already existing? The will of a few leading powers will be sufficient to prevent any war occurring in Europe.

The European confederation is still, no doubt, imperfect and incomplete, and cannot be compared to the uniform and harmonious system of North America. The way to bring it to perfection, that is to say, to draw more closely the ties

that exist between all the nations of Europe, is not, however, to rely exclusively on the exertions of diplomacy. We all know what value is to be set on the treaties of peace and eternal friendship exchanged between sovereigns. It is commerce, Gentlemen, that will finish what commerce has for so many years begun. Ten years of revolutionary energy and outbreak of passions in France, have not succeeded in converting Europe; despotism and military glory have proved unable to conquer and subdue it. The slow and unceasing labor of peace, the trade that it stimulates, the interchange of ideas and feelings of kindness that it favors, will have a more powerful effect. Let us rely, Gentlemen, on the extension given to railroads, to steam navigation, and the electric telegraph — that marvellous and quite recent invention, which one would almost think Pope spoke of, when he said that letters were invented

“To speed the intercourse from soul to soul,
And waft a thought from Indus to the pole.”

Let us rely on the want one people is in of the other, on the diffusion of human knowledge which already admits of a community between all nations in inventions of science and industry — in everything that can be useful to man. The sciences of old diplomatists, the will of autocrats, will not stop the world which is calling for freedom of commerce, and the instruction of the masses.

What struck me, Gentlemen, as really admirable in the idea of universal peace was, that it comprised all the improvements that can be imagined for mankind. After exhausting, as it were, the list of all the reforms, all the improvements — after extending human solicitude, not only to the woes that afflict us in our own country, but also to those which afflict the wretched in the most distant regions, it remained to give the idea its generalization, the human aspirations their definitive shape, their crystalization. That is the sanctuary in which the Spirit of God must find delight, because it is the expression of his commandments, the summary of his precepts, the application of the doctrines of the gospel. Grandeur even than the Crystal Palace, erected to the wonders of the material world, will be that altar of sacrifice on which men will all come to lay down their passions — to abjure their errors and their wars.

The action of civilization tends to suppress war, but alone it is not sufficient. We must hasten the natural course of things. We shall act thus in accordance with the views of Providence; we shall be, to use Bacon's expression, “its ministers, its interpreters.” Let us not remain satisfied with lamenting over the evils which encompass us — over the deeds of injustice committed around us. But should any king, or any people, display acts of oppression and conquest, we will point our finger at the culprit, as did the prophet of old, and say, “Thou hast sinned!” Last year, Gentlemen, they came to us, when we were at Frankfort, to invite us to be arbitrators in the Schleswig-Holstein question. A few weeks ago, the Prussian Government, by authority, suppressed the Peace Society established at Königsberg. Thus, days of triumph and days of reverse are in store for us. But we will remember the maxim, “No cross, No crown.” We have for our judges, not only our contemporaries, but posterity. Let our united efforts be directed to the destruction of the barbarism that yet remains in the world!

REV. GEORGE C. BECKWITH, D.D.—We have listened, Mr. President, to very eloquent denunciations of war; but the practical question now before us is, can we get rid of this terrible evil? I think the friends of peace may well take encouragement, not only from the promises of God in his word as the chief reliance of this cause, but also from the altered tone of statesmen on the subject, and the growing disposition of the people to demand, and of nations to employ, better means than the sword for the adjustment of international disputes. Here we may, I think, report some progress; and I rise not to discuss in full a topic so large, but merely to state what the friends of peace in America have attempted on this point in particular, and what are their prospects of success.

You are aware, sir, that the Americans pride themselves somewhat on being practical men; and this trait of their character has impressed itself upon their labors in the cause of peace, and led them to inquire with special earnestness, how the evils of war may be averted. Here is the pivot on which our hopes of

success must ultimately turn ; for declaim as you please against the atrocities and horrors of war, the question still comes back, and must be answered, is it possible to prevent these evils, and obviate all necessity for the sword? We all believe it is possible ; but how, or by what means? Not by miracle, nor by any supernatural or very special interposition of Providence. Not by extinguishing the war-passions of mankind ; for such passions will ever remain as part and parcel of their nature as fallen human beings. Not by putting a stop to all injustice, oppression, and wrong ; for more or less of these will continue to the end of time, in every country on the globe. Not by removing all occasions of international dispute ; for nations in their intercourse, like individuals in theirs, will always be liable to misunderstandings. Nor yet by ignoring or denouncing the professed aim of the war-system ; for, aiming avowedly at justice between nations, at the redress of their wrongs, and the security of their rights, its objects, as thus stated, are good, and must in some way be secured. How can they be? The sword has hitherto been used for the purpose, and will of course continue to be until something better is found to take its place ; but can we not devise some better expedients, and persuade nations sooner or later to use them, instead of the cannon and the sword?

Here is the substance of our scheme in the compass of a nut-shell. We propose the simple process of superseding war by rational, peaceful substitutes, that shall accomplish every one of its legitimate ends far better than the sword ever did or ever can. We ask nations just to settle their disputes in essentially the same way that individuals among us do theirs. And how are disputes between individuals settled? Invariably in one of two ways—by amicable agreement between the parties, or by reference to a third party as umpire. They must either decide the matter themselves, or let somebody else decide it for them. There is no other way possible either for individuals or for communities ; and, if nations cannot or will not adjust their own difficulties, they must of necessity resort to some form of reference as the only possible mode of adjustment.

Talk not of appealing to the sword for such a purpose. It is a miserable delusion. The sword an arbiter of justice? The shock of armies, the result of battles on land and sea, a criterion of right? Not a whit better than a bloody rencontre between two ruffians in your streets ; and just as well might you unbar the iron cages in yonder Zoological Gardens, and set the lions, and tigers, and jackals there at work with their teeth and claws to determine the thousand questions of law or equity now pending before the courts of England. The sword alone settles no points in controversy between civilized nations, but either leaves them precisely where it found them, or renders them still more difficult of adjustment. Yes ; fight as long as you please ; waste myriads on myriads of treasure, shed rivers and oceans of blood, lay all the cities of an empire or a whole continent in ashes, you must, after all, resort for the final adjustment to pacific expedients of some sort, as the only possible way of settling the disputes. Now, we wish simply to reverse this madly suicidal process, and to have nations, like sane men in society, employ these pacific expedients before fighting, and thus obviate the necessity of fighting at all. The question is not whether such expedients shall ever be employed, for they confessedly must be sooner or later ; but solely whether nations shall continue their old, brutal practice of fighting first, and then resorting to these expedients, or whether they shall employ them from first to last, and thus never fight. Here is the sole practical issue ; and the only conceivable use of war is to make the parties willing, after a sufficient experience of its evils on both sides, to sheath the sword, and betake themselves to rational, peaceful methods of adjustment. Expedients like these, as substitutes for the sword, we wish to provide in advance, and thus render war between nations just as unnecessary as duels are between individuals.

Now, one of our proposed substitutes for war, the one apparently most feasible, and likely to prove most effective in the present state of the world, is what I should call *STIPULATED ARBITRATION* ; that is, we urge nations to provide by treaty for the amicable adjustment of their differences by reference. Let them incorporate in all their treaties—unless they choose to form a distinct one for the purpose—a clause binding themselves to settle whatever misunderstand-

ings may arise between them, not by the sword in any case, but by umpires mutually chosen. We prescribe no details of the plan, as these will in every case suggest themselves; we merely insist that nations agree beforehand to have all their difficulties adjusted in the last resort by some form of arbitration, to abide by the decision of their referees, and claim, whenever dissatisfied, only a new hearing or a different reference.

Such is one of the practical substitutes for war which the friends of peace in America have been pressing upon the attention of their rulers. Last year, as for several years before, we brought the subject by petitions from different parts of the country, not only before the two houses of our Congress, but also before the President and his cabinet. The session was to be so short — less than three months — that we could scarcely hope for any final or decisive action before its close; yet so desirous were our friends of pressing the matter, if possible to a speedy issue, that I was requested by our committee to visit Washington on the subject, and see what could be done. I went, I must confess, with little or no hope of my immediate success; for though the petition from our society had been presented to the Senate by a distinguished Senator, with very pertinent and forcible remarks in behalf of its object, and had been received by that body with a degree of courtesy and favor quite unexpected; still it was referred, not to a select committee disposed to bring in a favorable report, but to an ordinary though highly important committee of the Senate, composed of men who knew little or nothing of peace as an enterprise of Christian reform, with a man for their chairman who had rendered himself, as a violent champion of the slave-interest, exceedingly obnoxious to the free states. Such were the men, apparently the most unpromising in all Congress, charged with the duty of considering and reporting on the question of substitutes for war, which we had brought before the national legislature. And how did they treat it? Why, to my surprise, the Chairman, after hearing a brief exposition of our object and plan, promptly replied, with characteristic frankness, 'you are right, sir; not only is your object unquestionably good, but the measure you suggest is perfectly simple and reasonable. Indeed, it is in substance the very thing we have all along been doing in our republic, the identical principle on which the members of our confederacy, these thirty-one state sovereignties, adjust their own disputes with each other; and the extension of this principle to our intercourse with other nations, so far from being at all objectionable, must work admirably well with our arrangements for the preservation of peace at home.' I must own that a response so unexpectedly favorable, made me for a time suspect the senator's sincerity; but in his treatment of the subject from first to last, I could discover nothing to justify such a suspicion. His conduct proved him to be in earnest; for he brought our request at once before his committee with such explanations and arguments as obtained their unanimous consent to a report, recommending the substance of all we asked, viz.: "that it would be proper and desirable for the government of these United States wherever practicable, to secure in its treaties with other nations, a provision for referring to the decision of umpires all misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation, in the first instance, before a resort to hostilities shall be had."

I am sorry the resolution did not stop with the word *negotiation*. Yet even with this sting in the tail, the resolution is a very auspicious beginning; nor will its objectionable close make much, if any, difference in practice. Never until war is actually and utterly abolished, will nations give up the right of an ultimate appeal to the sword. National disputes must be settled somehow; and, if all peaceful methods fail, the parties, in spite of their pledges to the contrary, will come sooner or later to blows and blood. We must obviate the supposed necessity of such a resort, by providing means that will actually settle their difficulties without the sword. There is no other alternative; and, if this peaceful policy should prove effectual for a long series of years, war will gradually die out, and come at length to be known like trials by ordeal and judicial combat — like the antiquated armor in the Tower of London — as a matter only of history, as an obsolete barbarism.

On this report in the Senate there was not found time for action; but had there been, there is no doubt it would have been adopted almost unanimously.

We felt, however, less anxious to have a vote, because we had already secured the substance of what we sought. As all our treaties must be ratified by the Senate; and as the Executive would of course shrink from negotiating any one which that body would be sure to reject, we wished merely to obtain such an expression of their views as would intimate in advance their readiness to sanction treaties containing the arbitration clause for which we plead. Such a pledge we did obtain; for after the expressions of opinion and feeling elicited, there can remain hardly the shadow of doubt, that the Senate would promptly endorse the principle of stipulated arbitration, so that the way is fully opened for our Executive to incorporate this principle in all our future treaties.

I found, also, other favorable indications among our rulers. I called on many members of the Senate, especially those who represent, as leaders, large masses in our country; and with the exception of a single man who had smelt gunpowder at the head of a regiment in the Mexican war, and thereby won his seat in the Senate, they all expressed themselves in favor of the measure we proposed as a substitute for war. With the Senate's printed report in my hand, I went to the President, who welcomed my errand, and said he had for some years felt much interest in the ideas we were diffusing through the community, and should be happy, whenever practicable, to carry into practice the proposal we urged. The members of his cabinet, one after another, expressed essentially the same views. Even the Secretary of War, though from the chivalrous, fiery south, said, 'I shall be very glad, sir, to see my own department done away, if you can persuade other nations to do theirs away at the same time. Your object is certainly excellent; nor can I see anything objectionable in the measure you propose for its attainment.' Another Secretary, at the head of a very important branch of the Executive, expressed himself in favor of our proposal, as fully and warmly as any member of this Congress could well do. After reading the printed report from the Senate, which I had presented to him, he turned to me with a look of incredulous surprise, and asked, 'do you say the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations were *unanimous* in this report?' I replied, yes, sir; I chanced to be in the Senate-Chamber when that report was presented by their chairman; and I distinctly heard him tell the Senate they were both unanimous and cordial. 'Well,' replied he, 'if I were at the head of the state department, I should deem such a resolution imperative upon me to negotiate *all* future treaties on that principle. Indeed, I have long been of this way of thinking; and sometimes I have been tempted to say, if nations will not settle their disputes in some such way, they should be compelled, if there be any means of compelling them, to do so. I assure you, sir, if the question should ever come before any cabinet of which I may be a member, I shall certainly give my vote in its favor; nor can I conceive any contingency in which I could not go for it with all my heart.' Here was the climax of warm-hearted response to our proposal; but I will just add, that from none of the Secretaries, or Foreign Ambassadors, or distinguished senators, did I hear a word hostile to the peace measure we were urging. Indeed, I was, as well I might be, very gratefully surprised at the degree of favor with which it was received in quarters so high and influential; nor can I doubt, after a somewhat careful inquiry into the state of feeling among the men now at the helm of affairs in Washington, that most of them, if not all, are disposed to favor this simple yet most important measure, and to put it in practice when they shall find what they deem a favorable opportunity. They may not choose, as we should, to create such an opportunity; but if a zealous, wakeful friend of peace could stand at their elbow, just to call their attention to the thing at the right time, they would, I have no doubt, begin ere long to weave the pledge of arbitration into all our treaties, and thus start a practice simple indeed, and apparently slight, yet sufficient in time to revolutionize the international policy of all Christendom, to supersede slowly but surely its whole war system, and put an end at length to the enormous exactions now required for its support even in peace.

From the more popular branch of our government, Sir, I might report facts hardly less encouraging; but I will only state here my full belief, that there is now going on in the minds of American rulers, as well as the American people, a very auspicious change on the subject of peace. I am chary of promises

but, if you will give us time enough in America to work, I trust in God we shall bring to another Congress, perhaps not very remote, a report more cheering far than anything I have now stated. God knows, as every laborer in this cause must have learned, that success can come even under his smiles only by faith, and prayer, and hard work; but, with these, and his own promises of peace, clear as the sun in mid heaven, there is no amount of success we may not confidently expect. Ultimate triumph is sure. Such a barbarism, such a monstrosity as war, cannot live for ever; nor can its follies, its atrocities, its unutterable horrors, project themselves far into the splendors of that brighter day which is coming. No; the monster must die. War *will* yet cease from the whole earth; for God himself has said it shall. As an infidel, I might doubt this; but as a Christian, I cannot. If God has taught anything in the Bible, he has taught peace; if he has promised anything there, he has promised peace, ultimate peace to the whole world; and, unless the night of a godless scepticism should settle on my soul, I must believe on, and hope on, and work on, until the nations from pole to pole shall beat their swords into ploughshares, their spears into pruning-hooks, and learn war no more.

Yes, Sir, I see, or I think I see, the dawn of that coming day. I see it in the new and better spirit of the age. I see it in the press, the pulpit, and the school. I see it in every factory, and steam-ship, and rail-car. I see it in every enterprise of Christian benevolence and reform. I see it in all the means of general improvement, in all the good influences of the age, now at work over the whole earth. Yes; there is a spirit abroad that can never rest until the war-demon is hunted from the habitations of men. The spirit that is now pushing its enterprises and improvements in every direction; the spirit that is unfurling the white flag of commerce on every sea, and bartering its commodities in every port; the spirit that is laying every power of nature, as well as the utmost resources of human ingenuity, under the largest contributions possible for the general welfare of mankind; the spirit that bids honest, useful labor proudly lift its bronzed and hardy brow before majesty itself in yonder palace of glass, that Christian Delos of the age, where men from every land come to shake hands as brethren of one great family, and forswear the guilty, suicidal competitions of the battle-field, for the blessed rivalries of peaceful industry and skill; the spirit that hunts out from your city's darkest alleys the *sans culottes* of poverty and crime for relief and reform, nay, goes down into the barred and bolted dungeons of penal vengeance, and brings up its callous, haggard victims into the sun-light of a love that pities even while it smites; the spirit that is everywhere rearing hospitals for the sick, retreats for the insane, and schools that all but teach the dumb to speak, the deaf to hear, and the blind to see; the spirit that harnesses the fire-horse in his iron gear, and sends him panting with hot but unwearied breath across empires, and continents, and seas; the spirit that catches the very lightning of heaven, and makes it bear messages, swift almost as thought, from city to city, from country to country, round the globe; the spirit that subsidises all these to the godlike work of a world's salvation, and employs them to scatter the blessed truths of the gospel, thick as leaves of autumn, or dew-drops of morning, all over the earth; the spirit that is at length weaving the sympathies and interests of our whole race into the web of one vast fraternity, and stamping upon it, or writing over it, in characters bright as sunbeams, those simple yet glorious truths, *the fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man*; is it possible for such a spirit to rest until it shall have swept war from the earth for ever?

Rev. JOHN BURNET, *Congregational Pastor, London*. — I have been in the habit of attending public meetings in this hall ever since its opening, but I have never been present at one of such length in which the audience on the whole manifested such enduring patience. If war is wisdom, we must indeed be a wonderful gathering of fools. But we are enthusiasts! Well, if this be enthusiasm, it is enthusiasm that lives for eternity. It seems to live and enjoy equal health everywhere; and there must be a vast amount of intellectual thinking on the part of those who support such a movement.

Where is the man that maintains the justice and equity of war? If there be such a man, I would strongly advise him to go to the Great Exhibition, and set

himself up there as a curiosity. Not only peace men, but military men even, would come and laugh at him for his absurdity.

Now, it is absurd to suppose that the combats of war can produce the decisions of justice. As well might you throw a quantity of materials into a field, and send a troop of horse trampling among them, and call that glass-making. The results of war are evil, and only evil. The community suffer both morally and materially; they become involved in debt in order that a few may gain by it. And when these few expatiate on the unavoidable necessity and glory of war, let them recollect the story of the old soldier who had lost an arm in military service, and was reduced to beggary. When the recruiting sergeant came to the village in which he lived, and attempted to seduce the young by his splendid promises and glowing pictures of the glory of war, he would lift up his stump and his beggar's bag, and tell them, "You'll come to this at last." So the sergeant found he could get no recruits there, and went away.

What, then, is to be substituted for war? Why, simply arbitration. We do not mean by this to establish a permanent despotism from which there shall be no appeal; but when differences arise between nations, let them mutually agree upon arbitrators, who, when their work is done, can dissolve. Is there anything unreasonable in such a course? The effect of arbitration would be to bind society together in the bonds of brotherhood. Arbitration belongs to all the courts of the civilized land.

But it is said we are not prepared for such an extreme step yet. Well, then, let us agitate for it. If our legislators will not grant it, let us continue to press it upon them. Ply them with petitions—deluge the House of Commons with petitions. Our Foreign Secretary is our servant. Let us give him no rest until we make him uncomfortable, and then he will bestir himself. I regard the present assembly as a living illustration of the practicability of universal peace; and I feel that the vast number of persons who have visited this country to witness the peaceful rivalry of nations in the palace of glass, affords abundant ground for saying, that the progress of the world may be best promoted by an union of science and commerce in the cause of peace. The peace of the world will be in future kept not by your Wellingtons, but by your Brewsters.

REDUCTION OF STANDING ARMAMENTS.

RICHARD CORDEN. — Having been, for the last two mornings, occupied until two o'clock, and kept out of my bed until that unseasonable hour, listening to debates in another assembly, and joining in divisions that I fear will lead to very small results, it must be admitted that I have made thereby a very poor preparation for doing justice to the important topics just placed in my hands, or for making myself heard in this most extensive and influential audience. But happily the theme upon which I have to address you, is one that does not require the stimulus of energy. I shall rather have to congratulate the meeting, that you have passed out of the first stage of your agitation, and no longer require to have your attention aroused and captivated by stirring language. The very appointment of your Chairman must be considered as a step in advance in the progress of your agitation; for his habits of simple examination, of careful balance, and of rigorous deduction, as applicable to the scientific pursuits in which he is engaged, lead him ever to apply the intellectual test, and to avoid all those passionate appeals which may lead you into the regions of the impracticable, however much they may charm by their grandeur or their novelty. I have, therefore, to congratulate you upon the selection you have made of a Chairman to direct your proceedings whilst engaged about the not impracticable object we have in view.

One proof of the wisdom of your choice has been already given in the fact, that the speeches which have followed his inaugural address, have appealed more to your reason and judgment than has almost ever been the case in such an assembly. I am glad you are taking this direction, and assuming such a tone in dealing with the question before you. It is nothing new to declaim against the horrors of war. For upwards of two thousand years there is scarcely a poet of eminence who has not told the world something about the horrors of war. There is scarcely a great writer who has not lamented over and de-

scribed them. In speaking about the horrors of war, therefore, we are but following an old example; but the question, the practical question, that has already been put to us, is,—How do you propose to get rid of war? And the practical object we have in view, is to answer this question.

Every one admits the desirableness of putting an end to war. Every one says, that it would promote the happiness and prosperity of the people, and advance the cause of religion. Well, then, that being so generally admitted, we have next to consider how evil has ever been done away with. Has it not been by propagandism? Has it not been by individual men going forth — by men thoroughly convinced themselves, and in earnest, going forth singly, and arguing with and convincing others, who in turn spread the truth further and wider, until it became generally acknowledged? For, if men who had truth on their side, are true to themselves, and to their cause, it will triumph in spite of all opposition.

I strongly urge this individual exertion upon you. I have been dealing with this subject in another place, where I have had a better opportunity than could be gained elsewhere of testing the progress of public opinion in this country; and I can assure you, that in proportion as you, the people out of doors, have shown a disposition to interest yourselves in the advance of peace principles, and in the diminution of war-armaments, in the same proportion have I found that an individual like myself, have in Parliament some chance of a patient hearing.

These remarks bring me to the resolution placed in my hands. It is not what can properly be called a peace resolution. In proposing it, I am assuming that we are in a state of peace. But what I propose is, that we should take steps to ensure the continuance of peace, and that, as a preliminary, we should not have war preparations kept up in the midst of peace. I maintain that, short of the actual sufferings, of the loss of life, and the devastation, which take place upon the field of battle, every other social and economical evil attendant upon a state of war, attends the keeping up of war armaments. We have not the battle-fields running with blood, nor the destroyed cities, nor the trampled-down harvests. That is all; for we have the heavy taxation; we have the demoralization of the barracks; we have the waste of the national resources occasioned by maintaining large bodies of men in a state of idleness.

And on what grounds are these armaments maintained in a time of peace? Why, forsooth, it is said to be because it is necessary to be prepared for war, in order to prevent war. That is the answer embodied in a motto which was found written over the gates of a large town in Belgium. I trust that our friend M. Visschers will have it removed. The motto was in Latin; but its meaning was, "If you would preserve peace, you must be prepared for war." People seem to have taken for granted the wisdom of the saying, and to have gone on in that belief until they found it was easy to discover a pretence for going to war, when they were always so ready for it.

I said some years ago, and I have been ridiculed for having said it, that I am not afraid of the countries on the continent of Europe going to war with one another. I said this three years ago. I said it two years ago; and I now repeat it. We have indeed seen commotions and wars upon the continent within this period; but they have been internal commotions and civil wars, not wars of countries with one another. We have seen indeed the war in Hungary, where the sovereign of Austria asked the sovereign of a neighboring country to aid him in putting down his revolted subjects. But we have seen no aggression of one great country upon another. In fact, we have seen nothing like the tendency to war which existed amongst the nations of Europe forty years ago.

But I must make this reservation — it is my belief that, if they go on increasing their armaments, increasing the numbers of their armies from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000, and from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 of bayonets, and if they continue to wring their subsistence from the industrious people in order to maintain those masses of idle men, the nations may become indifferent at length whether those masses do or do not come into mortal conflict. They may become tired of the burden, and even willing to get rid of it by allowing those soldiers to slaughter one another. I should not be surprised if the war party

which exists in every country, and those armies and their generals becoming anxious for war, should precipitate it. But if such a state of things shall arise, it will be in consequence of the existence of those masses of armed men, and not be because those mighty armies have acted as preventives of war.

I am now speaking in England to an audience, the majority of whom are Englishmen, although there are also foreigners here from every part of the world. And I am sorry to say that, with all our boasts, England and English wealth have done more for war, and for the maintenance of an aggressive attitude, than any other country in the world. In saying that England has done so, I am only giving her credit for that greater amount of energy which she has ever shown beyond all other nations in Europe with which I am acquainted — that energy which has enabled Englishmen to succeed in every enterprise, whether good or bad, in which they have ever embarked; an energy which makes them impatient even when they have altered their opinions upon a subject, if other people do not at once adopt their views. They were talking in this hall the other day about the slave-trade, and were quite impatient and intolerant with the rest of the world because they had not all at once changed their opinions upon the subject. Why, twenty years ago England owned more slaves than any other country in the world; fifty years ago she had almost the monopoly of the slave-trade; and with regard to war, England, which has not had an invasion that could be called such these thousand years or nearly, has had a better opportunity than any people in the world of remaining at peace; yet she has not only spent more money upon war than any other nation, but has heaped upon herself a greater debt than any other nation, not merely in paying the expenses of her own wars, but in paying other nations for cutting one another's throats. And now Englishmen are hugging themselves as being something better than other men, because they are favorable to peace! We believe that now at length England has come to her senses, and is pursuing a more pacific and less aggressive course than heretofore. Let us divest ourselves of the national pride and self-complacency which have been so much spoken of by foreigners. I have seen too much of that feeling of late. I have seen within the last few months flattery heaped upon Englishmen — laid on with a trowel. There is no greater danger to be apprehended to our character, no greater barrier to our improvement, than that we should listen complacently to the flattery of our nationality which is but a vulgar mode of cajoling the people of any nation. Let us only consider how we exhibit our desire for peace. Do we present before the people of the world the least aggressive attitude amongst the nations? What is the attitude which we present? Not to begin with our standing armament at home, what are our positions on the face of the earth? Why, where is the nation that has ever occupied so many and such strategic positions on the surface of the globe? We have fortified strong places, and garrisoned them all over the world to such an extent, that, if a war ever should come between them and any other strong maritime power, the first step necessary to be taken would be to blow up and abandon some of them. We have Gibraltar, Malta and Corfu in the Mediterranean. Crossing the Isthmus of Suez, we have Aden. Then come the Mauritius, called the outwork of India! Returning, we have a military position at the Cape. Crossing the Atlantic westward, we have the powerful fortress of Halifax, ready to meet all comers. Going from the Continent, we come to the island of Bermuda, where we are laying out enormous sums in fortifications; and it was but the other day I heard an argument to induce Parliament to keep up the fortifications of Jamaica! I will also mention the fortifications of Quebec, called the Gibraltar of Canada. But I cannot go on with the enumeration. I wish some military man, some one competent to the task, would sit down, and calculate how many men would be required to garrison those places; for I believe the first step necessary in case of a war would be to find an army to defend them, and then to find another army to defend our own shores.

Now, all those fortifications may be necessary, if being prepared, as some people contend we ought to be, were necessary. But it cannot be said that such preparations are necessary as matters of self-defence at home. I repeat, there never was in the history of the world a country that presented such an aggressive attitude as England does at the present moment; and if any man, or any

set of men, think we can be otherwise than a heavily taxed people, whilst such a system lasts, I can only say, they use a system of arithmetic I do not understand.

Well, then, such being our position, and such the attitude which we present abroad, what is our position at home? Have we been second to any other country in the augmentation of our forces at home? I have been sitting for the last three sessions upon a committee of the House of Commons for the purpose of inquiring into the expenditure of the army, navy and ordnance; and what have I ascertained? Why, that we have \$30,000,000 worth of warlike stores; a hundred line-of-battle ships afloat, or on the stocks; between 10,000 and 30,000 pieces of cannon; 30,000,000 of musket-ball cartridges; 140,000 pikes; 1,200,000 sand-bags ready for use in their fortifications! In short, we are armed in every point, and ready to enter upon a gigantic scheme of warlike operations to-morrow.

Then, England has not to complain of other countries having set her the example of preparing for war; for it was to England that other countries looked for an example. Why, we have shown, in the discussion in the House of Commons the other day, that England and France have been running a race, have been playing a disastrous game of see-saw about these preparations. At one time one sank below the level, and at another time the other. England has been building ships, and fortifying her shores, always quoting France, and the preparations making by France, as the reason. Then next session we saw France making fresh preparations, and exhibiting renewed energy, and quoting England as setting her the example. So it went on. Both have been equally to blame. I do not charge either with being more culpable than the other. But this I do say; that it is a question which it behoves the *people* of each country to take charge of. It is in order to abate the evil that we have met here to-day. I have been telling you some home truths with regard to Englishmen. I have heard foreigners say it was owing to our combative propensities that Englishmen are so energetic; that they are naturally combative; that it is in their heads, and they can't help it—they must be always trying to subdue some one or other. Well, then, if such are their natural inclinations and propensities, let us, at all events, look them boldly in the face, and see if we cannot turn them to some better account than we have hitherto done. That very energy which we have shown in our evil doings, must be brought to bear to abate the evil; and here is a task set before us in this Congress sufficient to employ our courage and perseverance quite as much as any combats in the field in which we may be engaged. For we should have to encounter slights, and sarcasm, and scorn, and misrepresentation, and slander; and it is quite as hard to meet these difficulties, as to face an enemy in the battle-field. It requires courage and perseverance, and coolness, and dogged endurance to the end. Let us not imagine there is nothing to be done.

I think people do not understand the operation of these standing armaments. I have already alluded to the demoralization of the barrack system. Again and again I requested my friend Mr. Richard, the secretary, to use his paper, the *Herald of Peace*, and obtain through some of his correspondents truthful descriptions of the operation of the barrack system. We can scarcely go into any town in the kingdom where barracks are planted without perceiving, that the immediate effect of barracks is to operate as a blight upon the whole surrounding neighborhood. I have tested it myself by the decreased value of the landed and house property in the immediate neighborhood of barracks; by the increased number of beer-shops and gin-shops, and places of a still worse description, which always grow up near them; and by the fact, that everything moral and respectable, everything virtuous and religious, seems to shrink from the foul and contaminating influence of the barracks. Knowing all this, I am asked to fall down, and worship a hierarchy whose works and moral influence are exemplified in the way I have described to be the effect of its residence upon the surrounding neighborhood; and I am asked to join at public festivities in toasting 'The Army' forsooth, as if it were something superior to the rest of the community. I would treat the army, and the men in the military service, as I would treat all others, precisely according to the individual merits of each; but before I fall down or

bend my knee in homage to them as a body, they must show me some better proof of their moral influence and worth, than are to be found in the quarters that surround their barracks.

So much for the morality of the system ; with regard to the expense, many think it is no use dinning into the people's ears the fact, that these standing armaments tend to impoverish nations in an economical point of view. This, however, is not generally known or admitted in society. Men have so little thought upon the subject, that their minds are not impressed with the loss inflicted on the community by maintaining in idleness an enormous body of men whose labors might otherwise be productive. The maintenance of this body is the occasion of a double loss — first, those who labor have to keep those who do not ; and next, we are deprived of the labor of those thus maintained, which might otherwise have contributed to the wealth of the country.

This is not generally known or thought of. Let us take some of the most distinguished of foreign statesmen — for instance, M. Thiers. Mr. Thiers, who sneers at political economy, has no sort of notion of the economical effect of keeping up these enormous armies. I believe he thought that, by increasing the army, you just find so much employment for so many more men ; and he never looked so far, he seems not capable of looking so far, as to consider whether these men's living in idleness — draining from the country, from the farmers and peasantry of the country, the means with which they would otherwise manure their land, and increase its productiveness — does not diminish the resources and strength of the country, by abstracting from productive labor those men whom he puts into blue coats, and lodges in barracks. I recollect hearing a noble duke, a leader of the Protectionist party, who made it a grave objection to me, that I was agitating a reduction in the army, and said, 'What good will that do you, farmers ? It will bring home some 20,000 or 30,000 men, whom you will have to keep on the poor-rates.' But the Duke of Richmond, like M. Thiers, is a leading Protectionist ; and, depend upon it, they ought to be both put to school. I wish my excellent friend, Miss Martineau, would take them in hand. They are puzzled how men can be kept, if not maintained in that state of idleness ; yet in this country we have seen 150,000 men discharged from the railway works within a year or two ; and in the parliamentary returns of the very same period it is shown, there had been simultaneously a considerable diminution in the number of able-bodied paupers, the laborers discharged having found their way into society, and got employment elsewhere. We need not, therefore, be alarmed on this head. If we have fewer soldiers, and these men put on smockfrocks or fustian jackets, you may depend upon it, such able-bodied men can keep themselves ; and, moreover, by the very process of discharging them from their work a saving of expenditure is obtained which permits a reduction of those burdens and taxes which impede the operations of commerce, and prevent the employment of the people.

Now, these are the principles and truths which we have to propagate in the world. This is our task ; nor is it an easy one. We have only just begun it ; but, if society were as strongly imbued as I am with the conviction of the loss to the people in material comforts from this system of waste and extravagance, it could not last a twelvemonth. Apart from the higher motives and sanctions which are always in harmony with the deductions of true science, if men did but understand the impossibility of getting relief from their burdens whilst this system lasts, the system out of which their sufferings spring, would soon follow the change in their opinions. When I visit such a place as Portsmouth or Plymouth, my feelings are probably as opposite as possible to those which influence many of my countrymen, when they see those great arsenals. When I behold gigantic constructions on the stocks, and hear the hammers resounding as they add to their number, my feeling is one of pain, and sorrow, and humiliation at the immense amount of waste of the gifts of nature incurred in constructing what I hope may never be called into use. I see in all this but weakness and decay, whilst others say, 'Here is the Queen of one hundred and sixty guns ; I should like to see the Frenchman that would dare to come and touch her.' And I am answered, 'You want England to disarm in order that she might be at the mercy of other countries ; for your movement is not general or

universal.' No, what we want England to do, we want all the world to do ; and I am sure that other countries will not have to set us an example.

But our first work is to persuade the world that something is *practicable* in the matter ; and I, for one, see no impracticability in doing anything consonant to our interest, and not contrary to the law of God. I wish we could be content to meddle less with wars that happen to be going on abroad, though I know the Peace Society is taunted with indifference to the progress of freedom. I want historical evidence, that standing armies are ever favorable to the cause of liberty ; that they have ever achieved liberty for any country. I charge you to go on as you have begun, if you wish to see progress made in the House of Commons, or in any other Chamber in the world. These are times when we have a better chance of success than heretofore. Nations are beginning to look great evils in the face, and to cease from bowing down to hoary abuses. They can now look upon intemperance, a vice which they know to be as old as the flood, and determine to put an end to it. If you, therefore, do on this question as on others, you will only be acting in harmony with the spirit of the age. If you show up the evils, moral and material, which are caused by war ; if you prove how it acts upon families, how it demoralizes and impoverishes the community, there are those among you who will live to see a total change in the opinions of men ; and when that change comes, down will go the system which a mistaken public opinion has upheld.

M. DE POMPERY, of Paris, speaking in French, said, wars of conquest have had their day, and the limits of nationality have at length been defined. God be thanked that we are now delivered from conquests and from conquerors ; and, if any great war should ever arise again in Europe, it must immediately assume the form of a war of principles, a war between despotism and liberty, between sovereigns and their people. He next showed, from history, that all the wars that have ever ravaged the earth have been undertaken to advance the interest, improperly understood, of the aggressors ; and he illustrated this general assertion by a quotation of particular instances, taking first the case of wars between barbarous tribes, and then those of Rome, England, France, and America. In the progress of civilization the true interests of man become evinced ; and now it is discovered, that the normal condition of society is a state of peace, not of war, just as the normal state of the body is one of health and not of fever. Man, if he aspires to the dominion of the earth by the force of his genius, has, as civilization advances, the more horror of slavery, under whatever form disguised, and at last equality will be the crown to encircle the brow of every son of Adam.

WILLIAM EWART, M.P., meagerly reported.—This immense gathering shows that the occasion presents a favorable opportunity for the interchange of opinions and sentiments of different nations ; and it also proves that, in the event of a war being threatened, we should be able to effect a powerful organization, which might extinguish the spark before it could rise into flame. In reference to the moral benefits of the Crystal Palace, the Prince who leads such an army of workmen as were employed in the construction of that building, is capable of effecting a greater conquest than ever was achieved by any army that ever trod down the principles of peace with the iron hoof of war, from the time of Alexander to the present day.

It has been observed that the organ of combativeness is largely developed in the English people ; but, according to the principles of phrenology, we must endeavor to counteract the preponderance of one organ by cultivating the development of another—viz., the organ of benevolence. I think that this great commercial nation, the greatest in the world, ought to commence this movement for general disarmament ; and, in my opinion, it would be to the eternal honor of the Anglo-Saxon race, if they displayed the peaceful olive branch of Minerva in order to put down war. I represent a deputation from Liverpool, who beg that means may be taken to promote the extension of the freedom of trade, and the encouragement of international commerce by means of an Ocean Penny Postage, as recommended by my friend Elihu Burritt. It may be Utopian, visionary, ideal ; but I firmly believe that the day will come when the system of an Ocean Penny Postage will be established.

I congratulate the Congress upon the great progress our cause has made. If you look around, you see abundant cause for hope. The nations are beginning to draw together in a more friendly spirit than has ever before existed; and as this intercourse increases, there is little room to doubt that their good feelings towards each other will increase also. I will conclude with the words of our great poet, Milton, who, if now alive, would be a supporter of our principles:—

Oh shame to man! men only disagree
Of creatures rational, though under hope
Of heavenly grace; and, God proclaiming peace,
Yet live in hatred, enmity, and strife,
Wasting the world, each other to destroy.

JOHN MCGREGOR, M.P.; a very brief report of a strictly extemporaneous but earnest and telling speech.—“One of the great objects which the Congress has in view, is to convince people that there is no advantage to be gained by keeping up standing armies. Public liberty is cramped, not preserved, by such a system. It is long since I gave up reading romances; but I have recently been reading a romance by M. Thiers, which that gentleman calls a “history;” and in that romance M. Thiers, fond as he is of standing armies, admits that public liberty in France was cut down when the first standing army was established by Charles II., and has been kept down by the standing armies of his successors.

Our eyes require to be opened to the evil consequences of rewarding only the destroyers of mankind. The Duke of Marlborough’s successor not only enjoyed Blenheim, but took between £4,000 and £5,000 a-year, on the postage of 8,000,000 letters, out of the post-office. How much better might such public rewards be employed! America does without a standing army; at least, her standing army is so small as to be only like a drop to the ocean compared with that of England.

The addition to the national debt, in consequence of the battle of Waterloo, has been so great that the whole of the duty on tea three shillings (or seventy-five cents) a-pound, received by the Exchequer since the year 1815 has been swallowed up by the payment of the interest on that addition; and what was the object and aim of that battle of Waterloo? Why, the overthrow of Napoleon and his dynasty, the utter subversion of himself and his family. And what is the result? Why, the legitimate successor of Napoleon, his legitimate heir, is now the sovereign of France. Let them call him President, or whatever other name they please, he is the first man,—the sovereign, in short, of France. And it was for this that Englishmen were saddled with such an addition to their national debt! I hope much from the efforts of the people themselves upon the subject of peace. The principles of peace are, I rejoice to say, spreading fast. But it lies with the people themselves entirely to bring them into active operation. They must exert themselves strongly in the cause before they can hope to produce any effect upon their rulers. I have been unable to obtain even a patient hearing in another assembly for the statements of the evils arising from our keeping up our present armaments, an assembly composed chiefly (it is idle to deny it) of men who have an interest in keeping up these armaments. And not only have I been heard with impatience in that other assembly, but I have further to complain of the press. I have to complain, that some of the daily newspapers, who advocate war, and the keeping up of war armaments, take care either not to report me at all, and those who advocate peace principles, or, if they do report, to misrepresent us entirely. I do not say, that all the daily papers act thus; but some of them, those which advocate war, and the keeping up of armaments, do so. It is for the people to do the work. It is with them the decision of the question lies. There will soon be a general election; and it is for electors (and I wish their numbers were greater) to send to Parliament only such men as will pledge themselves to advance the cause of peace.

WAR LOANS.

CHARLES GILPIN, Esq., *London*.—I rise to ask your cordial assent to a resolution which will probably be regarded by many as the most *Utopian* of all our *Utopian* proceedings. I sometimes think I must have been born in *Utopia*, for

all my best aspirations for the upward and onward progress of my fellow-men—even from my boyhood—have been connected with movements called Utopian. But it seems to me that he must be a bold man who, in the present day, would stigmatize as Utopian any effort made, or undertaking entered upon, by earnest-hearted men. Have we yet to learn that the Utopia of one age is the experience of the next; that the Utopia of one year is the experience of the next? Nay, more; the bright Palace of Peace and of Industry, whose iron girders and pillars may well symbolize the strength, and whose crystal sides and roof, the beauty of the principles of which it will ever remain the glorious illustration, (yes—*ever remain*); whether the building be removed, or be suffered to remain, to become the pride of our children as the glory of their sires, it will ever be enshrined in the world's records, as amongst the purest triumphs of the *mind of peoples*, undimmed by the mists of prejudice, the clouds of passion, or the effusion of blood. Well, this too was *Utopian*; but the world rejoiced to see what was the Utopia of January, become the *experience* of May.

We have denounced war in the abstract; we have condemned standing armies; we have stigmatised, and truly stigmatised, the barrack-system as immoral; and I now ask you to condemn the *sineews* of war, that without which war could not be carried on, in a word, *war loans*. Monarchs and despots would have to agree with their people, could they borrow no money to carry on war against them.

I am aware that I am treading on delicate ground; that the principle I would illustrate, if carried out to its legitimate Christian results, would condemn the conduct of many among us; but I am content to illustrate the principle, and leave the application to individuals. It would seem to require no great amount of reasoning to prove that, if war be wrong, it must be also wrong to furnish the *means* of war; and it can be accounted for only on the principle of a *corporate* as distinguished from an *individual* conscience, that we find honorable men, honorable in every position of private life, who yet do not hesitate to advance these loans when they know the purpose is to sharpen the swords of tyrants, and to forge new fetters for peoples. Make it an individual act, and all see the enormity. If I wish to rid myself of an enemy, and, scrupling to stain my own hands with his blood, employ another man to act the bravo, am I not accountable for the deed? If our excellent Secretary (to take the most unlikely person) wished to destroy a personal enemy, and hired an assassin to do the deed, but, not having money enough to pay such assassin his demand, comes to me to borrow the money,—if, knowing the purpose for which it is required, I advance it, am I not as responsible for the murder as the assassin himself?

When the hireling hordes of Russia invaded the fair plains of Hungary, carrying ravage and destruction in their train, trampling out the altar-fires of Hungarian liberty, forging chains, and building scaffolds for the best and bravest of her sons, the Autocrat of the North came to England, asking for a loan, and he got it; and shame upon certain great houses in the city that he did. I was actively engaged in getting up the great meeting at the London Tavern, at which Mr. Cobden so eloquently denounced that loan; and I shall not soon forget how one city man after another declined to take the chair; one, a known friend of the Peace cause! saying, "Really the affair is so blown upon, it would affect my credit;" and I was at length obliged to take the chair myself. Shall those capitalists be held blameless who advance their money for such a purpose?

Again, when Austria, a country which, above all others, has weakened itself by seeking to be so strong, her immense standing armies eating out the very vitals of the state; when she comes to this country for loans, as she has done, and will do again, and we know, and capitalists know, that her object has been, is, and will be, to enable her to set her foot upon every thing that is free in the various countries subject to her sway, shall we, in the advancing light of civilization and Christianity, unhesitatingly take the hand of the man who thus knowingly lends his money for the purpose of destroying a nation's independence, to slaughter her patriots, or immure them in Eastern dungeons, and to employ the dagger of assassins to strike at the life of one of the purest patriots of modern times—the illustrious Kossuth! O! I am as confident as I am that there is a tribunal above where the actions of men will be tried by other standards than

that of a rate per cent.; that there is *another tribunal* erecting, of enlightened and christianized public opinion, whose verdict on such acts and actors will be veritably *guilty*. When this time shall come, when men will in such matters submit, as submit they must, to public opinion so expressed, we shall have abolished one of the great causes and supports of war, and have hastened the advent of that better day, to the aspiration for which, all but loan-mongers may surely respond, AMEN !

“ O ! hasten, great Father, the blest consummation,
When nation no more shall lift sword against nation ;
When War shall no more be the Christian's vocation,
But the sword shall be shivered and broken the bow.”

EDWARD MIALL ; a shrewd, strong speech, imperfectly reported. — “ The morality of loans for the purpose of war is the topic before us. It naturally divides itself into two parts — perfectly distinct, and easy to be remembered — the borrower and the lender.

I think it a question well worthy of serious and minute investigation, although not to be determined at this Congress, whether national loans, for any purpose whatever, can be considered justifiable. There is this peculiarity attaching to them, that they who immediately expend the money, are not those persons who ultimately pay the money. I regard it as unjust in one generation to mortgage the industry of generations to come. I do so, because I thoroughly believe in that principle of the British constitution — alas, but very imperfectly carried out at present — that no man ought to be taxed except with his own consent, or by the consent of his representatives. Now, we cannot consult posterity ; and it is obviously a hard thing to come into this world of ours, where there are troubles enough ready to seize hold upon one, to find that our powers of resistance have been drawn upon by our remote predecessors. Even, therefore, in matters which can be regarded as necessary and beneficial to posterity, inasmuch as posterity cannot be consulted, I do not believe that it is right in any body of men to take upon them to draw a bill, payable by the generations to come after us.

But if there be any question upon this point, there can be none when the object for which the money is to be expended, is one involving not the prosperity of nations, but the destruction of their resources. I know it is said that if posterity is to come into existence at all, it is sometimes necessary to wage defensive war. I do believe that in assigning a judgment as to whether a war be necessary or unnecessary, if posterity could be consulted, they having to pay the ultimate expenses, would have a far different opinion upon the question from those who have little of the expense to bear. If we in this day, with our advanced intelligence, and our unhappy experience, had been consulted, or could have been consulted, about undertaking the war against our American colonists, or the long wars undertaken in order to receive the Bourbons upon the throne of France — wars which together have cost about five hundred (more probably fifteen hundred) millions of pounds — I venture to say that we should come to a very unanimous conclusion, and be able to express it in both Houses of Parliament, that such wars were altogether unnecessary. What enlightens us ? The fact that we have to pay for them. If we could only make each generation pay for its own wars, if wars were never carried on upon credit, if only the cash had to come out of the pocket before the operations of war could commence, I think the judgment of Parliament would be very different from what it is, as to what constitutes the necessity of international war.

I come now to the lender — usually the great capitalists of the country. I am not going to indulge in absurd denunciations of capitalists. I regard them as occupying an appointed sphere, and having a proper use. I believe a very large number of those who hurl indiscriminate abuse at their heads, would be glad to be in their places. Capital has been described as condensed labor. The capitalist adjusts the application of that condensed labor to some particular object. His power is immense — his usefulness might be immense too. His responsibility is consequently great. Of all classes, his is the last that should be exempted from moral laws. Their operations so greatly affect the well-being of society, that more than any other they should be exactly scrupulous not to trespass beyond the limits of those rules prescribed by morality and religion.

And yet the common feeling is that, in regard to the spending or lending of money, those principles ought not to be consulted. It is useless for us to find fault with the capitalists — even those of them who negotiate war loans, and are, therefore, the principal means of continuing war. They do but act upon the common sentiment of society; for who does not receive them with open arms, or feels ashamed of tendering to them the intimacies of friendship? We have not to fling tirades at the heads of capitalists as such, but to educate society up to our mark.

This is the only way by which we can hope to accomplish the object we have in view. People ask, or will ask, how is it possible that a few men meeting in Exeter Hall can reach the capitalists of Europe, and affect their operations, or prevent them from sustaining war? I say we are proceeding precisely as that man would proceed, who, entering the chamber of a patient prostrate beneath the power of a contagious fever, and finding the window fastened down, should dash his fist through the glass to let in the fresh air. We cannot, it may be, accomplish much — we don't believe that what we do will accomplish every thing. But we are certain of this — that the result at which we are aiming cannot be finally reached until we have made a pure atmosphere of opinion. I, for one, have implicit faith in the power of that atmosphere to ameliorate the condition of humanity. I, for one, believe that whilst we are adopting in physical disease those milder methods which are prescribed by Nature — while we are getting beyond that ignorance which once sanctioned the maxim, that nothing was so good a curative for the body as bleeding and warm water — whilst we are allowing Nature to rectify herself, or rather are content to assist her in performing her own work — so in the moral world there is a great deal to be accomplished of which your practical men know very little. As by underground draining, subsoiling, and other processes of that nature, the wholesomeness of the atmosphere may be promoted, so things are gradually telling, not upon the main disease perhaps, but upon the constitution of humanity itself. Mankind is growing healthier, and as it grows healthier, will be able to throw off the diseases now hidden in its blood. Why, what got rid of witch-burning? An improved public opinion. What got rid of persecution for conscience sake? An improved public opinion. What got rid of duelling in this country to a great extent? Not law, not judicial proceedings, but an improved public opinion. What will put down military establishments, and prevent international wars? An improved public opinion; and in creating that improved public opinion, we are now practically engaged.

SAMUEL GURNEY, Esq., *the great London Banker, and brother of the late Elizabeth Fry*. — I fully concur in the terms of the resolution, though I am not prepared to agree in all that has been said upon it. I heartily approve of the motion which my friend, Mr. Cobden, lately made in the House of Commons, with a view to cut down the army and navy estimates to the extent of ten millions sterling; and in my opinion, if the legislature were governed by a Christian spirit, that motion would have been carried.

I coincide entirely in the opinions which have been expressed respecting the consequences arising from the National Debt; for I feel that an interest which amounts to nearly 30,000,000*l.* a year, must operate as a check upon our national advancement, and as an obstacle to the carrying out of free-trade in all its perfection.

I am truly glad to witness the large amount of sympathy with the cause of universal peace which this Congress has elicited from influential persons of different countries. I must acknowledge that I had at one time looked upon this movement with feelings of suspicion, fearing that it touched too closely questions and interests of a political character; but I am now free to acknowledge, that I have been mistaken, and that while entirely agreeing with the resolutions of the Congress, I have heard but very little from the speakers themselves, with which I could not also unite.

MR. COBDEN, just at this stage of the discussion, drew forth a general burst of applause as he said, "there is a prospect of a loan (if we may judge from public rumor) being required from this country by a Government which is at this moment violating every one of those principles on which this Con-

gress is based ; a Government which is maintaining an army at so enormous an expense, that the country is doomed to bankruptcy. The army of that country is spread over almost the whole face of Europe, from the extremity of Italy to Hamburg, where the troops are openly insulting the inhabitants. As I feel myself precluded at present from 'showing up' the financial condition of that country, and warning the people of England against the bankruptcy which threatens it, I will no longer dwell upon the subject ; but I make this stipulation with our Secretary, that if an application for the loan to which I have referred, should be advertised, and he should summon a public meeting at the old place, the London Tavern ; and if I should be within the borders of England, no matter where, I will give my attendance on the occasion for the purpose of raising my protest against such a proceeding, and expressing my want of faith in any transactions with the Austrian government, and the inevitable consequences that must ensue from negotiating a loan to that government.

J. S. BUCKINGHAM, Esq., *London*. — If our present pacific views had always prevailed, there would in all probability have never been any public loans contracted at all. If mankind had been seriously intent upon fulfilling the first command of the Deity, to increase and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it, the united labors of each generation would have been sufficient to effect this without the aid of public or national loans for the purpose. But the extravagant exigencies of war exceeding enormously the modest demands of peace, our national debt, as well as that of most other countries, commenced by the respective governments of the day expending more capital than the yearly revenues of their countries would yield, and therefore anticipated the revenues of futurity by contracting loans, and incurring the burthen of annual interest on them to be added to the previous taxes. And unfortunately the wars which such loans had to carry on, were almost uniformly wars against liberty and human rights, not in their favor. For instance, the American war increased our national debt by more than two hundred millions sterling ; and for what ? To prevent our colonial descendants on the American Continent from establishing a government of their own, and being independent. Did these two hundred millions, borrowed for this purpose, effect the object for which they were expended ? Certainly not ; for, though we got together the finest army that men and money could secure, with an ample commissariat, a powerful naval fleet, and all other appliances of war, the united efforts of the people whom we sought to oppose and oppress, drove our forces ignominiously from their shores, and compelled Great Britain to acknowledge the independence of America, and receive an ambassador from the new Republic, much against the will of the Sovereign and his Court, but to which they were obliged to submit.

Again ; in the wars waged by England against France, not less than six hundred millions sterling were added to our debt for subsidies to allies, and support of our own immense armaments, to do what ? To restore the Bourbons to the throne of France, and impede the spread of republican principles. Were these wars more successful in obtaining the end for which they were undertaken, than that against America ? Assuredly not ; for the Bourbons, though relieved for a brief period, were again expelled to make room for another dynasty, which has since met with a similar fate ; and, instead of suppressing republican doctrines, these have spread so widely, and taken such deep root in France, Italy and Germany at least, not to mention other lands, as to include among their adherents twenty times the number of people that formerly professed them.

Here, then, are proofs of an immense waste of treasure, not merely to no purpose, but ending in the promotion of the very objects it was meant to destroy. Contrast this crime and folly with what would have been the probable results, had all this treasure been expended in the fulfilment of our duty, and in obedience to the divine command. With such an amount of capital, thus mischievously and destructively expended, millions of acres of barren land might have been made fruitful ; cities built and embellished, instead of razed and destroyed ; schools enough established, and teachers enough provided, to educate every ignorant person living ; mines of wealth explored in the rich bowels of the earth ; fruitful harvests gathered from its surface ; institutions improved ; commerce extended ; and happiness widely diffused among millions of intelligent and im-

mortal beings. And shall it be said that mankind are irresponsible for this perversion of the gifts of God to purposes of evil rather than of good? Yet they who contend that the lender of capital is in no degree concerned with its misappropriation, make this assertion, than which nothing can be more repugnant to reason, morality and religion.

In addition to the illustrations already offered as to the criminality of furnishing the means of doing evil, and the general sense of mankind on this subject, I will present another. For example, if a chemist and druggist has prepared a poison, and through his carelessness in not apprising the party to whom he sold it of its deadly nature, a death has ensued, even this is held to be so serious an offence, that juries have repeatedly brought in verdicts of manslaughter for such culpable negligence, and the parties have been subjected to severe punishment accordingly. But suppose the vendor of the poison to be aware, that it was intended to be administered to another for the purpose of his destruction, and that without his aid the event could not be accomplished, he would be justly condemned as guilty of murder, being an accessory before the fact, and the principal contributor to its accomplishment. Now, in what does this differ from a loan of money made by certain rich capitalists to any government for the purpose of carrying on a war, without which such war could not be prosecuted, except that the last greatly exceeds the first in the extent of the evil to be produced, and consequently in the depth of its criminality? If it cannot be deemed an innocent act for a man to lend a poignard or a musket to another, who, without such aid could not procure either, the lender at the same time knowing, and the borrower even averring its intended appropriation, how can it possibly be either innocent or honorable for any one to lend the money by which alone the murderous machinery of war can be got together, for the express and avowed purpose of invading a country, or subjugating a people, and putting to death in battle all who should dare to resist?

In conclusion, I would say that, when Mr. Miall stated the amount of our expenditure in foreign wars at five hundred millions sterling, he greatly underrated the magnitude of the sum, which would be found to be nearer fifteen hundred millions than five hundred, and of which indeed we have still eight hundred millions in our national debt at the present moment, demanding an annual amount in taxes of twenty-eight millions to pay the interest of it only.

Before I sit down, I cannot but congratulate this vast assembly on the rapid progress we have made of late years in the public favor. It is now twenty-five years ago that I first attended a meeting of the Peace Society in the Friends Meeting House, White Hart Court, Gracechurch Street, when the late venerable and venerated Dr. Pye Smith presided, and when the number present did not exceed a hundred persons of both sexes. We have now a meeting of probably four thousand present, with nearly a thousand delegates from the provinces, and from the Continents of Europe and America, representing probably a million of the friends of peace in the several localities, whose hearts beat in unison with our own, and who are present in spirit, though absent in body, from this great and important gathering. Let us thank God for the past, and take courage for the future; and in his own appointed time, our cause will become that of the whole earth.

CONGRESS OF NATIONS.

ELIEU BURRITT, whose speech was the only one on this great theme, and of which we copy entire the report in the *Herald of Peace*.—"It has fallen to my lot, at the two previous Congresses, to present this or a similar proposition. On the last occasion, I endeavored to show that this is not a peculiarly American idea, either in its origin or its development; and I now recapitulate the arguments then adduced, to show the necessity and great advantage of an international code. The Congress is but a step in advance of the greatest jurists and statesmen in Europe, in affirming that such a code would be of immense benefit; we only assert, besides, that it is practicable. The idea of our American friends is, that a commission of the jurists and diplomatists of Christendom might revise the so-called code, eradicate its antagonisms and anomalies, and

constitute a federal court for its administration. That which stands as a substitute for international law, is to be found only in the writings of scholars and historians—of Vattel, Grotius, or Puffendorf, and consists of opinions, arguments, and precedents, the latter being the essential element and basis of the whole. As those precedents consist of such acts as the absorption of Poland into Russia, Prussia and Austria, and every act defended from those, such as the American annexation of Texas, and French intervention in Italy, being incorporated with those precedents, the whole body is very much like what civil law would be if every transgression were to be put down as an authority and sanction for subsequent offences." Passing from this argument, the speaker invited his audience to consider the position of their great cause in the light of the principles of moral government, historical development, of contemporaneous circumstances:

"Time and Providence, in all the vicissitudes and events with which they work, mark the experience of individuals, or measure the progress of nations, bring but one *now* to man, or to any human enterprise. Every great event or undertaking that has blessed the world with its beneficence, has had its own peculiar *now*. And if the present year is not the *now* which God has given us for the realization of the hopes we entertain, and the measures we purpose, that *now* will come, for the mouth of the Lord of Hosts has spoken it. It will come, but not by observation. It will come; but the star of its advent will be recognised only by a few shepherds, looking and longing for its appearance. Who discussed the fact that this year was the *now* of the Great Exhibition? Was it the spontaneous and universal conviction of the public mind that the set time had come for this magnificent demonstration in the Crystal Palace? No; its advent was comprehended by the faith of the few. Even to them it did not come by observation. They had no pathometer wherewith to test the sentiment of the world towards their proposition. It was not in their power to feel the pulse of the divided populations of the earth to ascertain whether their multitudinous heart beat in sympathy with the idea of this grand gathering of the nations. How, then, did the princely author of this monarch-thought of the age, and his dauntless coadjutors in the conception, ascertain that its *now* had come; that the mind of the world was ripe and ready for its realization; that the predilections of people and the pathonomy of Providence were in happy conjunctures for this brilliant consummation?

The circumstances under which they put out their great thought are full of instruction and encouragement to our faith. Ten years ago there were no interests in the commonwealth of nations so mutually antagonistic, so jealous of competition, so adverse to reconciliation, so ambitious of precedence, so determined to rise on the ruins of another, as the mechanical and agricultural industries of the different populations of Christendom. Years of elaborate legislation had arrayed these interests against each other in lynx-eyed and tireless hostility. The artizans of one country were taught to regard their brethren of the spindle, hammer, and spade, in another, as natural enemies in the battle of life and labor. They were taught to conceal their skill, to lock their mechanical genius in closed oak laboratories, lest it should be purloined by foreigners. "No admittance here except on business," was written in barking bull-dog capitals over their factories and workshops. Abundant admittance to *buy*, but none to learn, was the meaning of this threatening monition. Even to the first day of 1851, the jealous tariffs of different countries seemed like lime-twigs set to catch and cripple the thought of bringing the Arts and Industries of all nations into one central Crystal Palace of Peace and Concord.

In addition to this circumstance, a deluge of angry agitations was rolling over the Continent of Europe. During the last months of 1850, thousands, and tens of thousands of the well-skilled artizans of Prussia, Austria, and other German States, had laid down the peaceful implements of their handicraft, and were disciplining their hands to the bloody trade and weapons of war. And was this the time, was this the juncture and coincidence of auspicious opportunities for the Great Exhibition of the Arts and Industries of all Nations? So the originators of this wonderful event believed. Unaided by legislation, with no governmental power or authority to lean upon, they sent out their idea dovelike,

among the divided populations of the earth. It dropped into the hearts of peoples like a still small voice of divine inspiration. It permeated the minds of the masses, touched their sympathies to the finest issues, and pervaded and united all with the common sentiment, that the great day of universal labor had come, when it was to be crowned with glory and honor and the homage of potentates and peoples. Labor, patient, peaceful labor, that, from the closed gates of Paradise went forth weeping into the thorny wilderness of life, and traced it with the red pathway of her bleeding feet—Labor, hopeful, unassuming Labor, that had made bricks without straw in Egypt, and lain pale and hungry, and begged for crumbs on the door-stones of palaces which her peeled hands had filled with treasures and dainties more than the eye and appetite of ungrateful luxury could enjoy—Labor, that had walked and worked her way through the barbarisms and feudalisms of the past, with the fetter-prints of bondage still fresh and crimson around her limbs—meek, lowly-minded Labor, had come to her immortal *now*.

But the result of this grand experiment has a bearing upon our efforts and expectations far beyond the value and significance of an illustration. Great as are its triumphs, immeasurable as may be its consequences, it did not transpire on a line of human progress which may, in some dim, distant future, converge into the road which we are pursuing. No, the lines of the Great Exhibition, and the annual Peace Congress of Christendom, have already merged into the same highway of peace and harmonious brotherhood. It is not our doing. It is the work of Divine Providence, and it is marvellous in our eyes. It is not our doing. Let no one charge us with the ambitious assumption of this fact. Others have said it for us—others, of the highest authority, and in the audience of a listening world. The originators of this demonstration, and those who glory loudest in its principles, claim for it, as its highest honor, this result. Their fervid orators, in the glow of enthusiastic eloquence, point to the Great Exhibition, and say This is the true Peace Congress. They claim for it the character and object of our annual Peace Parliament of the People. They promise to realize the result for which we labor, to be first at the goal, and carry off the prize. They do not say that they are against us, or competing with us in a parallel race-course, but that they are far in advance of us on the same high road toward the object of our affections and aspirations. Then, what becomes of the charge that we are going too fast and too far, when the originators of the Great Exhibition are boasting that they have taken the cause of Peace out of our hands, and are conveying it forward to its final consummation with railway speed, because that our expectations and progress move so careful and slow? The world, almost without a dissenting voice, admits that the set time had come for this great demonstration; that the preparation of the popular mind of Christendom was complete for the realization of this scheme, even beyond the boldest conception, the most sanguine expectations of its originators. And it had but one single end from the beginning, and that was *Peace*. Let us grant it gladly and gratefully. That is the only end of our annual Peace Congress. Then will not the preparation and sympathy of the hearts of nations, and the co-operation of Divine Providence, which have crowned their undertaking with such mighty success, accrue to the realization of our aim and efforts? If their *now* has come, with such overplus of happy circumstances, can ours be far off? I trow not.

SELECTION OF PEACE MEN FOR RULERS.

M. DE CORMENIN, of Paris, whose speech in French was thus translated:—When I represent to myself this institution of the Peace Congress in its most comprehensive form, and consider its elevated objects and aim, I perceive that we are all tending, by one and the same common effort, to the abolition of the violent death of men; to the abolition of death against nature. I reduce the cases of violent deaths, that is, of unnatural deaths, to four principal heads; viz., violent death by the cannon and its accessories; violent death by the pistol and its accessories; violent death by the poignard and its accessories; and violent death by the scaffold and its accessories. Thus, it is towards the abolition of

these four kinds of death that we are tending, and by the following means : the abolition of violent death by the cannon and its accessories, by the abolition of war ; the abolition of violent death by the pistol and its accessories, by the abolition of duelling : the abolition, at least, the diminution, of violent death by the poignard and its accessories, by the abolition of crime, so far as we hope we may be able to bring it about by a good religious and moral education, and by the amelioration of the condition of the people ; lastly, the abolition of violent death by the scaffold and its accessories, by the abolition of the extreme penalty, and by a reform of the criminal code.

Now, this is to say that we tend, and that we ought all to tend with might and main, to the suppression of the soldier, of the duellist, of the assassin, and of the executioner ; four kinds of persons whom assuredly I am not going to compare nor to confound, but who resemble one another by the violent death, the death against nature, which each of them inflicts upon our fellow-creatures. For this reason I believe it to be perfectly understood, that Peace Societies, holding in profound respect the life of man, and directing their attention to the four kinds of aggression which are most destructive to that inspired breath, that creation of his hands, that emanation from himself, that gift of life which comes from God alone, and of which God alone may deprive man, will use their most strenuous efforts to bring about the abolition of war, of duelling, of murder, and of the scaffold.

As, however, of all their modes of killing men, the oldest, the most barbarous, the bloodiest and the most disastrous in every respect is war ; it is war, which, above all, and before all, we ought to, and which we must oppose.

Now as against war, the very best possible philosophical, political, moral, religious and financial reasons have been either written, or in some shape or other presented, I do think the time has arrived to pass from the phase of controversies and dogmatisms, to the phase of application. Doubtless, Gentlemen, we attack a prejudice, and the very absurdest prejudice which afflicts humanity ; nevertheless, to this day, absurdity has, in almost every case, enjoyed the peculiar privilege not only of governing the world, but, what is the absurdity of absurdities, has had the good fortune to gain over the wags. Nay, more ; the oddest fact of all, a fact which is really to be deplored, is, that the folks who are themselves the greatest victims of war, are the very people who are the pronest to make game of peace-men, and who laugh the most at those who wish to save them ; exactly like that good wife who was beaten by her husband, and who complained and went into a great rage because her husband was prevented from beating her.

With such simple folks it is difficult to reason. But when one perceives that one is losing time and pains in attempting to prove to simpletons that they do wrong in injuring others, what remains to be done ? Why, there only remains for us to deprive them of the means of doing the mischief. As a matter of course we shall have all the trouble in the world to make those governments understand who have no other strength but in the amount of their material force, and to make that numerous class understand which depends upon war and the war system for a subsistence, and which you will deprive of the means of existence if you deprive them of the means of killing others ; I say, we shall have all the trouble in the world to make these parties comprehend that they would do well to disarm with a good grace. Now, don't believe, Gentlemen, that they are going generously to tear off and throw away their epaulettes, and undeck themselves of their glory. O no ! but if you will only do this for them, just take away their sashes and their scarfs, their cannon and their grape-shot, you may be quite certain that these great warriors will not, for the simple love of glory, repair to the field of battle, and set-to in their black coats, boxing one another ; their fanaticism for an Arbela, a Pharsalia, an Austerlitz, or a Waterloo, would not carry them so far as that. No money, no war ! Now-a-days nothing is done *for* nothing, and war least of all. But one does not make war with one's own money, but everybody's money — with the money of every one who is stupid enough to pay in this way for being killed.

For all that, Gentlemen, there are in the world a few sensible persons who would rather not be killed, either they or their children, and especially who

would rather not have their money taken from them. Now, how is this to be managed? How shall we prevent their being deprived of their money? For, after all, I repeat, no money, no battles! I see no other means, but must confess it is a rare good one, than to diminish the numbers of that heroic and expensive species of men called warriors.

Now, how shall we diminish the numbers of these glorious devourers of budgets, unless it is by diminishing the grants made through the budgets? And how shall we diminish these grants made through the budgets, except by nominating only such members to represent us as will vote for the reductions we require? And how, again, shall we nominate members who will vote for such reductions, unless it be to recommend those who have a vote to elect only friends of peace, resolutely determined not to hold the lives of men, and the money of the people, cheap, and who will vote ever and always against warriors and wars in every shape, and of every kind? This is the course I desire to suggest, and to support.

INTERVENTION BY ONE NATION IN THE AFFAIRS OF ANOTHER.

HENRY VINCENT, *England*.—I congratulate this assembly on its imposing appearance, the logical order and the perfect unanimity of its proceedings. I have no doubt they will affirm with earnestness, and continued unanimity, the rights of individual nations to independence, and declare that the violation of such independence is an outrage upon Christian feeling, and rebellion against the best tendencies of modern civilization.

I will not stop to inquire how nationalities arose, whether from geographical and physiological, political and religious diversities; but I will illustrate the mutual relation of nations by that of families—every home sacred from invasion; if disputes arise, there being deputies ready to implead, and magistrates to decide. Why should it not be so with the countries of Europe, whether the noble people of Hungary, or the equally noble and unfortunate people of Italy? Though ministers of religion yet dare to hold the red flag in one hand, and the New Testament in the other, and to baptize with the sanctity of the gospel of peace the demon-god of war, whose footsteps through the world are tracked with blood, we are resolved to rally the people beneath its white flag; and, though many are still content to talk by their firesides of abstract truths applicable to no circumstance, and say, 'Them's the principles for me, but the time has not come yet,' we say, the time *has* come, the time *is now*!

We English are not the people to give lessons to others against military intervention. We have not only the bump of combativeness, as we have been told, but another protuberance, which I may call the organ of continual meddlesomeness. Events will teach the lesson, and enforce the principle we hold out to-day. Let it not be supposed that the end of the chapter of 1848 has come. Though Hungary has fallen by brute force, she shall rise again by the force of virtue and right, and Rome, though she too has fallen by the arms of France, her sons wear on their face the ineffaceable impress of the ancient dignity; and on the confines of the Austrian department in the Great Exhibition, behold Italy triumphs in the elaborated sculpture and painted loveliness of her works.

Brute force is a power that decays, a glory that wanes; the elements of peace are the immortalities. I look to the education of the people, the imbuing of the minds of the honest working men of England and of France—aye, of France, who will be represented here to-morrow by fifteen working men of Paris, with the principles of the gospel, to secure both liberty and peace. I hope for this, I believe in it, because God has said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free!"

M. GARNIER, *Professor at Paris*, one of the French Secretaries of the Congress, made an elegant and effective speech in French, translated at the moment by Mr. Cobden, *lingua corrente*, with much applause; but here are the only fragments preserved in the report.—"The intervention of one country in the affairs of another has been in past times a constant source of wars; and if, in the future, any shall arise, they would arise out of the same cause. The various motives for this interference he next explained and condemned, asserting

that in some cases the object was simply to show authority, and in others to maintain fixed what naturally must ever be oscillating, the 'balance of power.' This, he argued, was first one thing, then another; different before and since Napoleon's wars; at one time requiring Belgium to be joined to Holland, and a few years after, wanting it to be separated again. He then combatted the notion, that to propagate our own notions, and diffuse our own opinions, we might make war. We had no right whatever even to propagate truth by force. All that we had to do was to set a good example, and trust that other people would follow it. M. Garnier made some other observations, throughout all of which he was loudly cheered.

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS.

Mr. HENRY VINCENT, on the third day of the Congress, introduced fifteen working-men of Paris as the representatives of as many different trades in France; and one of their number, M. PIERRE VINSARD, a working engraver, read with much vivacity an address in French, of which the following is a translation:—

Citizens of the world! you give at this moment a great lesson. Differing in character, in manners, in language, you are united by one common thought, universal peace. Honor, threefold honor, to you! Receive, then, the sincere thanks of the working-men of Paris, sent here to study the Universal Exhibition. They are happy and proud to be admitted within these walls. Happy, for the thought that animates them is the same as your own. Proud, for you have thus proved your sympathy for them. Yes; we more than all others ought to thank you for your endeavors to annihilate that scourge which has desolated the universe for so many ages. For it is upon us manual laborers that war weighs with its heaviest burden. War! it crushes our existence. From producers, which we are, or ought to be, it transforms us into instruments of destruction. Our hands, destined to ply the shuttle, or hold the plough, are by it covered with blood, and employed for the destruction of men whose existence is useful. God has created us for the giving of life; but war often employs us to inflict death. War! it has frequently no other end than to satisfy the ambitions and interests of which we are always the victims. War! It perpetuates our ignorance; it annihilates our faculties; it makes of us machines when we ought to be intelligent producers. It removes the cultivator of the soil,—that soil which is our mother-nurse,—and it carries away the mechanic from his work-shop. Every soldier who falls on the field of battle, is one producer the less on the field of industry. War! Under the pretext of glory, it takes us, full of marrow, and force, and vigor, and often leaves us feeble and mutilated. War! It is not only violent, terrible; it takes all forms, and presents to us mechanical laborers, its most sad, its most poignant aspect, in the shape of misery.

Citizens of the world! In uniting your efforts against this scourge of the great government, you destroy the causes of pauperism, which, like a consuming insect in beautiful fruit, takes away from our civilization a part of its power, and casts a shadow over the picture of our industrial splendor. So long as one portion of humanity suffers, all others must feel the effects; for those who suffer will protest and struggle, and that peace which we long for cannot be realized.

Citizens of the world! Thanks to you, a hundred times thanks to you, for your benevolent welcome. The Delegates of the Working-men of Paris wish to testify to you their gratitude. The people begin already to stretch out their hands fraternally to each other; and that which struck us most, in entering this great city was, that there existed no barriers. Nationalities are disappearing; and, in a few years, by your efforts, they will exist only in name. Their rivalry can now be excited only by those productions of their industry, which they shall create and distribute among all men, by one and the same country, until the time when the word and idea, Nation, shall be effaced from our language and manners. The greatest nation will be that which counts the most happy laborers and the fewest soldiers.